

~~SECRET~~  
SECRET

12. April 1956

Chief, EE  
Attn: [ ]  
Chief of Base, Munich

INFO: GOS

Operational/CART/HIWAY

Dr. Bela LIBZKA - Status Report

REF: MEMA 1891A, 24 January 1956

Developments

1. Subsequent to the AVH approach to Subject reported in reference, Subject received in early February a joint letter from his wife and son in Hungary, in which they both again urge him to return home. (See Attachments A and B). The son also mentions in the letter knowledge of Subject's living conditions in Germany. Since Subject states that he has never described his living accommodations to his wife or son, this is a clear indication that the same was given this information by Karoly ROSE or some other AVH agent. It also seems probable that this letter was written under AVH instruction, and is their next step following their approach. Pursuant to our instructions, Subject wrote an answer to his wife and son in which he told them that the necessary preconditions for his return to Hungary did not in his opinion now obtain, but that his primary concern continued to be the welfare of his wife and son. (See Attachments C and D). There has thus far been no reaction to this letter of Subject's.

Subject Meetings (through 8 March 1956)

2. [ ] has met periodically with Subject since his approach. A number of the points covered during these meetings will be clear from the attachments we are submitting to Headquarters as listed below - supplementary and other points of note are the following:

a. Subject has discovered, upon digging up those letters still in his possession from the interchange with his son reported in para 5 c of ref, that in fact the incident occurred in 1953 and not 1954 as reported in ref. (Comment: Subject has shown himself a bit hazy on dates, see further para 2b below.) Subject has also submitted the following supplementary information stating that the incident had come back to him more clearly in the interim: The friend of Subject's son who was to brief Subject on the worsened situation of the son and Subject's wife, was allegedly a student friend of the son who was about to take a vacation in Austria and Switzerland, not a business man as in ref. Subject's first answer specified a meeting in Constance on 25 March 1953 and Subject and James STORFAY-STITZ actually traveled to Constance on this date to meet the son's friend. When they returned, Subject found a letter

~~SECRET~~  
SECRET

~~KAZAK~~

RNA-30450

~~SECRET~~

waiting for him in which the friend, who signed himself Miklos KOVACS, writes from Vienna that he would be unable to make the meeting on 25 March, and suggests as alternate a meeting in Bern before the Restaurant Casino, on Casino Platz, on 5 April 1953. Upon the advice of the I.S. office giving Subject guidance via STUMFAY-STITZ on how to deal with this development (of ref), Subject wrote to KOVACS that because of past difficulties he could not make the suggested meeting. (Comment: Subject states that he does not remember the address in Vienna to which he wrote, and that at the time STUMFAY-STITZ's I.S. office had kept the envelope on which the address had been given.) Subject received a subsequent letter from KOVACS from Bern on 7 April 1953 again suggesting a meeting before the Restaurant Casino on 12 April 1953. Subject did not go, of course, and the only aftermath to the affair was that in a later letter his son wrote that he was sorry Subject had been unable to meet his friend. (These three letters are forwarded to Headquarters as Attachment G (a), (b) and (c). Subject remarks that KOVACS letters are written in a remarkably feminine appearing hand.)

b. In one of the initial meetings with Subject he disclosed that he had formerly been involved in Ingelstadt in informant activities for the CIC. Subject was asked to write an account of this, which he did, and the account is forwarded as Attachment K. It will be noted that Subject is hazy as to whether he commenced these informant activities in 1947 or 1948. Although the account is fairly scanty we do not feel it worthwhile to press Subject for any further details on this incident. We will however request CIG to run a routine trace with CIC to see whether anything of note results.

c. With respect to the biographical information we are forwarding on Subject (Attachments H-J), we are fairly well satisfied with the amount of information we now have on his past life and feel only a certain lack of information on Subject's activities and relationships during the recent years. We will try to remedy this lack in the course of time, however, we seem to be up against two momentary obstacles. One, our (we hope deft) attempts so far to get Subject to open up on his present personal life, have met a blank wall which appears to be based primarily on Subject's feeling there isn't much to relate, more than that there are certain personal circumstances he is unwilling to tell us about. Two, in view of the time that has passed since Subject's approach, Subject is beginning to suspect that he will not be recontacted. Consequently, and normally, he is beginning to show a little irritation with the time consuming process of obtaining information from him about himself, which increases as his conviction grows that it will all turn out to be a waste of time and effort anyway. Thus for the moment we are going slow.

d. It has been clarified that Subject was not deliberately holding out on us in not mentioning his MHEK membership from 1949 to 1953. Subject states that he did not mention this membership when [ ] asked him in the first meeting about his political affiliations because: 1) he had been out of the organization for such a long time he did not really feel it pertinent; and 2) theoretically the MHEK was not at the time he was a member a political group, and one of the [ ] he left was that it had begun to

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

assume a political character. Subject related the whole story of his reason for leaving the HMMK which conforms pretty much to the information we originally got from [ ]

e. It was recorded in ref that we were not quite sure of Subject's motives in agreeing so readily and without much question to a DA operation. Subsequent observation indicates that Subject has on the whole a somewhat weak character and probably is easily swayed by authority or any vestiges thereof. We thus suspect that the mere fact that the AIS, an authority in Subject's eyes, suggested, i.e. desired that, Subject involve himself in the operation, may have been in itself sufficient inducement. We also believe, contrary to Subject's protestations reported in ref that he considered the fate of his wife and son outside his hands, that Subject genuinely fears (at least now after reflection) that harm will come to his wife and son if he appears too adamant in his resistance to the AVH, and that consequently any playing with the AVH which may be necessary to protect his family had best be done under our guidance, and with the advantage of our professional experience.

f. With respect to the eight Hungarian language intercepts we are forwarding as Attachment N, we regret having to burden Headquarters with this job, but we feel the intercepts should at least be skimmed to ascertain whether they are pertinent to the present situation with Subject.

(Is too burdened to undertake the task.) We call your attention to the fact that one of the intercepts is of a letter of 14 March from Subject's sister Ilona FEKETE in Budapest. Since our last meeting with Subject was on 8 March, he has not had a chance to report receipt of this letter, and we are inclined to believe that were there anything of significance in the letter, Subject would have called us.

Attachments:

The following attachments are submitted:

A - Letter in the Hungarian language received by Subject from his wife and son per para 1 above. The letter is dated 31 January 1956; it was mailed from Budapest on 2 February 1956.

B - Translation of this letter by Subject into German.

C - Letter in Hungarian written by Subject in answer to the above letter per para 1 above. This was written by Subject on the basis of an agreed text worked out by Subject and Whitehart in the German language.

D - Rough translation of this letter by LAMBACH into English. The translation indicates that Subject conformed on the whole to the agreed text.

E - The letter in Hungarian from Subject's son delivered to Subject personally by Karel ROSE per reference.

F - Translation of this letter by Subject into German.

G - Three letters from the interchange between Subject, his son and a "friend" of his son in 1953, which are assumed to have been AVH inspired (of para 2a above).

H - PRQ I on Subject.

I - Short life run on Subject.

~~SECRET~~

~~WASH~~

WMA-20439

~~SECRET~~

- World War I POW Experience.
- K - Statement by Subject of Circumstances of his Informant Activity for GIC in 1947.
- L - Information on Professor Josef HUBER (of reference).
- M - Information on Geheimrat Hans HUBER, Subject's current accommodation address for his personal correspondence with his family.
- N - Eight intercepts on Subject's personal mail, per above para 2f. (Sister, Bud, Met, Rat.)

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

10 April 1956

Attachments: As stated

**Distribution:**

- 3 - WASH w/1 cc A,B,C,D,E,F,G,H,I,J,K,L,M.
- 3 - COS w/o A,B,D,C,E,F,G,H; lcc H,I,J,K,L,M.
- 1 - MOB w/1 cc all atts except N

hvp

~~WASH~~

~~SECRET~~